



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
04/422,724	04/20/84	HARPELL	P 91774.1

FELFE AND LYNCH
805 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER	
FRIEDMAN, S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
125	2

DATE MAILED:

03/10/84

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-17 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.
8. ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation).
10. ☐ The ☐ proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections **MUST** be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

Serial No. 622726

-2-

Art Unit 125

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as the disclosure is enabling only for claims limited in accordance with the disclosure at various places of the specification. See MPEP 706.03(n) and 706.03 (z). "A pharmaceutically acceptable gallium salt" and "a gallium salt" are broader than those specifically disclosed. The various claims are broader than warranted in the absence of amounts for the active ingredient.

All of the claims are rejected for a lack of proof of utility (35 U.S.C. 101). "A disorder associated with ...etc" is clearly broad enough to read on ⁱⁿcredible areas; e.g. cancer. Further, "preventing" renders the claims questionable as such reads on cure.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability

Serial No. 622726

-3-

Art Unit 125

shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Merck Index.

The compounds are clearly old and gallium has been administered to humans.

The preventing aspect of the claims renders the host readable on the prior art host. The composition is prima facie obvious.

All of the claims are rejection for a lack of proof of utility (35 U.S.C. 101) in view of Merck Index.

The human toxicity data clearly indicates undesirable effects.

Friedman:rjt

A/C 703

557-3920

08/08/84

Stanley J. Friedman
Primary Examiner
Group Art Unit 125